REMARKS

Amendments to claims 1, 19, and 39 are for the purpose of clarifying what Applicant regards as the invention. Amendments to claims 6 and 24 are to bring these claims into conformity with the language of their base claim(s). No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,178,511 (Cohen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,158,010 (Moriconi), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0023440 (Franklin). Claims 19-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Moriconi, Franklin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0082818 (Ferguson), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0026592 (Gavrila). Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Moriconi, Franklin, and Gavrila.

Claims 1 and 39 have been amended to recite locally associating the user role that is at the central directory with one or more privileges, wherein the act of locally associating is performed at one of the network nodes that is associated with the central directory. Claim 19 has been amended to recite one of the collection of roles associated with a privilege that is locally defined at one of the one or more database network nodes. As such, claims 1 and 39 require that while a user role be stored in a central directory (e.g., globally), the associating of the user role with privilege(s) be performed *locally* at a network node. Claim 19 requires that the privilege be *locally defined* at a database network node.

Applicant respectfully submits that Moriconi does not disclose or suggest the above limitations. In particular, column 4, lines 19-33 of Moriconi discloses:

> In the preferred embodiment, the system comprises a policy manager located on a server for managing and distributing a local client policy based on a global security policy, and an application guard located on a client or server associated with one or more clients for managing access to securable components as specified by the local client policy. *The global policy specifies access privileges of the user to securable components.* The policy manager may then distribute a local client policy based on the global policy to the client or server. An application guard located on the client or server then manages authorization requests to the securable components as specified by the local client policy. Each authorization request may be recorded in an audit log to keep track of the authorization

requests, whether they were granted or denied, and other useful information.

(Emphasis Added)

As such, Moriconi discloses a "global" security policy that centrally manages access privileges, and does not disclose or suggest *locally* associating a user role that is at the central directory with one or more privileges (wherein the act of locally associating is performed at one of the network nodes that is associated with the central directory) as recited in claims 1 and 39, nor does Moriconi disclose or suggest a privilege that is locally defined at one of the one or more database network nodes, as recited in claim 19. Also, since Moriconi specifically requires that privileges for local network nodes be centrally managed by the "global" security policy, Moriconi in fact teaches away from locally associating at a network node a privilege with a user role, and from locally defining a privilege at a database network node.

Cohen, Franklin, and Gavrila also do not disclose or suggest the above limitations, and therefore, fail to make up the deficiencies present in Moriconi. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests the above limitations, they cannot be combined to form the resulting subject matter of claims 1, 19, and 39. For at least the foregoing reason, claims 1, 19, and 39, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over the cited references and their combination.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all pending claims are believed in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518**, referencing billing number **7010852003**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518**, referencing billing number **7010852003**.

Respectfully submitted,
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

Dated: February 12, 2007   By: _____
                                 Gerald Chan
                                 Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111-4074
Telephone: (650) 849-4960
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800